Gerakoulis 113351

REMARKS

Claims 32-35 and 38-42 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Gilhousen et al. Claim 32 is amended herein to make it clearer, and all claims starting with claim 36 are canceled in favor of new claims 57-67. It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 32 is not anticipated by Gilhousen et al, and neither are all of the remaining claims.

Relative to claim 32, it is noted first that the claim specifies a step of sending an access request message that identifies party A and is spread with orthogonal code g_1 . No such message is taught or suggested by Gilhousen et al. Second, claim 32 specifies an acknowledgement message that specifies orthogonal code ω_A . No such message is taught or suggested by Gilhousen et al. Third, claim 32 specifies a step of sending a payload message only if an acknowledgement message is received that is responsive to the access request message. Such a condition is not taught by Gilhousen et al. Fourth, claim 32 specifies that the payload message is in a format

where at least most of the payload information is conditioned for its direct submission to the packet network

Such a message format is not taught by Gilhousen et al. Based on the above four distinctions, where each one is believed to be sufficient for concluding that the claim is not anticipated by Gilhousen et al, it is respectfully submitted that claim 32 is not anticipated by Gilhousen et al. Correspondingly, claims 33-35, and 66, which directly or ultimately depend on claim 32, are clearly also not anticipated by Gilhousen et al. Claim 67 is not anticipated by Gilhousen et al for similar reasons.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims is respectfully solicited.

Dated: 11/06

Respectfully, D. P. Gerakovilis

Henry T. Brendzel

Reg. No 26,844

Phone (973) 467-2025 Fax (973) 467-6589

email brendzel@comcast.net